IMC Meeting Minutes: 01-20-2006

Minutes transcribed by Jennifer Larsen, OSPB and Lauren Latterman, OIT.

I. Call to Order: 1:30 pm – Chairman Picanso

IMC Commissioner attendance: Cadman, Coleman, Dennis, Lutz, Malinowski, Marroney, May, Mulford, Pommer, Picanso, and VanDerSchouw.

Introduction of Commissioners and audience members.

A. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Picanso recognized Rep. Jack Pommer as a newly appointed commissioner appointed by the House of Representatives.

B. Meeting Minutes

Motion	(Motion: Senator May, 2nd: Commissioner VanderSchouw)

To approve the meeting minutes for November 18, 2005 and November 30, 2005 IMC meetings. No December 2005 meeting was held.
Approved unanimously.

C. Motions and Action Items

Chairman Picanso called forward Arlene Booker, OIT staff, who provided the Commission with a review of the November 18, 2005 Motions and Action Items list, and facilitated the following discussion:

Motion #3. Senator May asked for the status of the IMC proposed Rules. Chairman Picanso provided the Commission with a brief update on the status of the Rules process: as follows

- the Rules have received favorable opinions from the Attorney General's office and there are no legal deficiencies.
- the Rules have been filed with the Secretary of State's office in time for publication in February 10, 2006 Colorado Registry.
- the Rules have been filed with Legislative Legal Services ahead of their February 2, 2006 deadline. Legislative Legal Services potentially could raise the following issues: 1) is it within agency power? 2) does it conflict with statute?
- the Rules will become effective March 2, 2006.

Action #2. Chairman Picanso noted that there are several non-OSPB reporting agencies currently working with OIT regarding their budget decision items. OIT staff are working to obtain sufficient information from these agencies, and expect to provide OIT analysis to the IMC in February 2006. Chairman Picanso commented that a concern is whether or not these agencies have provided information specific to an IT reportable project. Commissioner Marroney asks how we are defining a project that is "reportable" from the judicial branch. Senator May interjected that the intent is to have an Executive Director and their CIO report to the Commission when they have an IT project. Any new project requiring approval needs to report to the IMC. All IT projects or procurements over $25,000 need to be reviewed by the Commission. Senator May mentioned to the Commission that there is a proposed bill that will increase the amount from $25,000 to $100,000.

Action Item	(Chairman Picanso)

Chairman Picanso will arrange to meet with Commissioner Marroney to further discuss the IT "reportable" projects from the Judicial Branch. The Secretary of State may also need to be involved in the conversation.

II. Old Business

A. Projects Readouts (Arlene Booker, OIT Staff)
1. IMC Executive Monthly Project Dashboard Report
Arlene Booker provided the Commission with a brief review of the IMC Monthly Project Dashboard.

a) Department of Labor and Employment (CDLE) - *genesis* Project
Rick Grice, Executive Director of Department of Labor and Employment

Rick Grice introduced himself and reported that according to the contract deadline, the transition process between the vendor and CDLE will be concluded by Tuesday, January 24, 2006. He commented that the department has received an $8.2 million refund from the vendor which, added to the $7 million the project has withheld in pending payments provides $15 million the department will use to hire a new contract to finish this project. Rick Grice stated the department is currently 84% complete with all of the action items in the transition. They will begin re-baselining and assess where to go from there, and estimate this process will take 2-3 months. Rick Grice commented they also are considering re-naming the *genesis* project.

The Commission briefly discussed the fact that the vendor of this project was awarded other state agency projects. Commissioner Mulford stated that in the future a contractor's past performance should be a part of the state's hiring considerations.

Senator May asked if the *genesis* project could provide a preliminary recovery plan to the Commission by March or April, 2006. Rick Grice called forward his CIO, Steve Uretsky, who explained to the Commission that they are working on a recovery plan, and estimates the re-baselining process will take approximately 90 days. Steve commented that he is hesitant to estimate a date for reporting to the Commission at this time. Rick Grice stated that a basic plan could be brought to the Commission in March 2006, and then return in June 2006 with a more polished plan.

Representative Coleman confronted Rick Grice regarding the department's lack of a more detailed project status. Representative Coleman stated that she would like to have seen a more detailed timeline for the future of the project and what the re-baselining efforts would actually entail. She expressed her frustration directly to Rick Grice and commented that the legislature is very impatient because the department has known for some time the *genesis* project is in trouble.

Rick Grice responded that his department must re-group to determine how best to move forward. He reiterated that this project will provide a progress report for the

Commission in March 2006. He further added that the goal is to bring the system completely online by 2007 and expects by September 2006 they will be ready.

Commissioner Lutz commented that the Commission is in a position to help get this project back on track and he would like to see the Commission more involved in helping to derive the solutions in the months to come. Commissioner Lutz requested to see more complete reporting on the current issues for *genesis* project on a monthly basis.

Chairman Picanso offered to facilitate discussions with the department to aid in the progress of this project. Senator May suggested that the IMC Subcommittees, specifically the IT Risk Management Subcommittee, could provide further assistance.

b) Department of State – HAVA/SCORE Project: Brian Mouty, Project Manager, Scott Lee IV&V staff, and Patti Fredrick, HAVA Director.

Patti Fredrick reported that the contract with Accenture was terminated in December 2005. She stated that over the course of the contract, the State had paid Accenture a little over $1.4 million, and according to their agreement Accenture will reimburse the Secretary of State's office $2 million. With this money Patti feels confident that the department will be able to successfully implement this project, although not in time for the August primary elections. Patti stated that they are taking this project very seriously and their main priority is to have a reliable system in place. They hope to have another vendor in place by mid-spring, and projected that the project will not be implemented until 2007.

Senator May asked since they will not be ready by the August primary elections, will they be ready for the November elections. In addition, Senator May asked if this state is not ready, would we have to get excused by the federal government or incur a penalty and repay them money. Patti responded that the state does not have to repay any money, and commented that there are 21 other states that will not make the deadline. The federal government is aware of this and are being lenient.

Secretary Dennis stated that they are starting this project over with a clean slate and anticipates to gain from what other states have learned. The county clerks are reluctant to jump into a new system between the August and November elections and would prefer to wait until 2007. Secretary Dennis stated that the current voting system is good, but is manual in each county, whereas, this new project would be an electronic system statewide. Secretary Dennis emphasized that she does not anticipate any problems with our election results this year.

Commissioner Marroney suggested that a list of warning signs that may arise when dealing with vendors be distributed so that other state agencies could learn from this project. Chairman Picanso offered to help with the distribution of the list.

Commissioner VanderSchouw submitted a motion that the IMC support the SCORE project's need to push back one year to allow more time. Representative Coleman seconded the motion. Commission discussion focused on whether or not this motion

is needed. The Commission determined that they do support the department's decision for the one year delay therefore, the motion is not necessary. Commissioner VanderSchouw withdrew the motion.

c) Department of Personnel and Administration – Email Consolidation Project: Guy Mellor, Deputy Director – DPA-DoIT

Chairman Picanso commented that Commissioner Malinowski had provided a presentation on the Email Consolidation project to the Enterprise Architecture subcommittee earlier today. Guy Mellor provided a brief presentation on the Email consolidation project, with a handout, detailing the specifics of the project. Guy emphasized that this is one of the Governor's initiatives and his department, DPA-DoIT will be the supporting agency for the project. DPA is proposing that Phase I will entail a detailed architectural design. Guy commented that the Governor has earmarked $575,000 from the Governor's Office budget as seed money for the project. Guy estimated that starting February 1, 2006 it will take 60 days to create a baseline. Guy stated this project anticipates returning to the IMC meeting in April 2006 with a recommendation, and seek the Commission's approval.

Guy Mellor reported that the state Chief Information Officer is responsible for this project. He further added that the project's the Executive Steering Committee is comprised of John Picanso – State CIO, Mark Weatherford – CISO, and Rick Malinowski – Director of DoIT.

Senator May asked if all servers will reside at DPA and if departments will be charged by the box. Guy responded that six servers will be housed at DPA and six servers will be housed at the Disaster Recovery site. Guy stated that currently, departments are paying $6.34 per box, and they are trying to keep the new system under $8.00 per box.

Guy Mellor called forward Mark Weatherford, who emphasized the need for this project to improve email security throughout the state. He stated that by consolidating, it will be easier to secure the system as a whole and will lead to better anti-virus and spam security. Mark stated that currently, each department's servers are being secured by the individual departments.

Chairman Picanso noted that the proposal is to reduce the amount of servers which has the added benefit of security. He stated that the State of Colorado owns the domain colorado.gov, which, combined with the Portal Initiative, will give all state employees the same email address: firstname.lastname@colorado.gov.

Commissioner Marroney expressed his concern that there are some people, i.e. judges, who may not want their email addresses to be so accessible. He asked if the email address change will be required for all agencies. Commissioner Malinowski responded they recognize that there may be a need for some individuals to be excluded from the email address change, i.e. the Executive Branch officials. Chairman Picanso clarified that the need to exclude some individuals or groups from this email address change will be addressed in the architectural design phase.

Commissioner Marroney questioned where the cost was being derived from, and asked what was included in the price to ensure the proper comparison between the projected cost and the current stated costs from agencies. Chairman Picanso stated that throughout the private or public sector, email generally costs $9.00-10.00 per box. Chairman Picanso emphasized the need to collaborate with the agency CIO's and Executive Directors to collect good data.

d) CBMS Project – CBMS Office Director, Dr. John Witwer.

Dr. Witwer provided a CBMS update handout to the Commission and walked through the presentation. Dr. Witwer's presentation focused on Food Stamps and Cash Assistance Monthly Payrolls, Medical Payments, the Emergency Processing Unit, the Centralized Data Entry Team for case processing, Benefit Freeze Flag Data and Help Desk Tickets. In addition, Dr. Witwer provided a brief court updated that included the trial date has been set for June 2006.

Commissioner Lutz asked when a Lessons Learned document on CBMS will be available. Dr. Witwer responded this effort needs to be planned and would include the need to control scope, IV&V, one decision maker, and maintaining funding, etc.

III. New Business

A. IT Contracts Task Force

Chairman Picanso called forward Elain Radford, OIT and Phil Holtmann, State Controller's Office who provided a brief update to the Commission on the IT Contracts Task Force. They provided a handout to the Commission that included: an Executive Summary, IT contracts Task Force schedule, letters from the IMC to the State Controller, and state agency Executive Directors and Chief Information Officers, two model IT contracts and an IT Administrative Guide. Elain clarified that the two model IT contracts and the IT Administrative Guide are presented for IMC adoption. Their presentation was based on the Executive Summary since a formal presentation was provided to the Policy Subcommittee that morning. Elain noted that representatives from the Attorney General's office and State Controller's office served on the task force and were instrumental in the development of these documents.

Elain stated that the IT Contracts Task Force was established by the IMC Policy Subcommittee chaired by Representative Fran Coleman. Elain explained that the Task Force has met every two weeks since September 2005 and their final determination is the need for two model IT contract templates, due to the fact that state agency contracts predominately fall into either of two categories: (a) license agreements, or (b) system integration efforts. The two proposed model IT contracts are:
1. Model IT contract for services/integrations to be used for system development efforts in which the state will own the code and the software created by the contractor.
2. Model IT contract for license agreements to be used for purchasing equipment with operating systems.

Phil Holtmann explained to the Commission the statutory authority of the State Controller to require state agency use of model contracts. Elain referred the Commission to the IMC letter to the State Controller, in the handout packet, seeking the State Controller's approval and required use of the model IT contracts for state agencies on all future IT contracts.

Commission discussion centered around the role of the State Controller's Office to develop policy for model contracts and oversee all state contracts.

Senator May expressed his concern that more than just a template is needed because the state needs competent IT expertise to match what vendors have. He commented the state needs to include a negotiations and review process. Phil Holtmann responded that a key benefit of model contracts is for state contract administrators to have consistent contract language making it easier for contract administrators to become familiar with contract terms, thus making negotiating and managing the contract easier. In addition, vendors will become familiar with state IT contract and know what is expected, making negotiations easier.

Motion	(Motion: Commissioner Marroney, 2nd: Commissioner VanDerSchouw)

IMC adoption of the two model IT contract templates for state agencies to use and the IT Administrative Guide to be used for training state contract administrators on IT contract management best practices.

Discussion: The Commission approved sending the IMC letters to the State Controller's Office and the State Agency Chief Information Officers. Additional discussion was centered around an IMC letter to the Attorney General's Office, not specific staff, requesting the Attorney General's Office send a formal letter to the State Controller recommending state agency required use of the two model IT contract templates.

Amended motion: IMC adopt the two model IT contract templates and the IT Administrative Guide, and approved sending the IMC letter to the State Controller's Office and adding State agency Executive Directors to the letter for the Chief Information Officers. The IMC letter to the Attorney General's Office will be sent but not addressed to specific Attorney General's Office staff.

Approved unanimously.

B. **2006 Information Technology Strategic Plan**
Chairman Picanso provided a draft copy of the 2006 Information Technology Strategic Plan document as well as a schedule for the planning process. He clarified that statute requires a Statewide Communications and Data Processing Plan (SCDP), and currently there exists both an SCDP and a Statewide Information Technology Plan (SITP). The draft copy of the 2006 IT Strategic Plan replaces both the current SCDP and SITP documents. The 2006 IT Strategic Plan has been presented to the IMC Subcommittees and the CIO Forum for review and feedback. OIT requests that all feedback on this document be sent to Lauren Latterman, OIT staff, (lauren.latterman@state.co.us). OIT will present the final document for adoption at the February IMC monthly meeting.

IV. Subcommittee Readouts

A. Enterprise Architecture (EA) Subcommittee

Commissioner Mulford reported that the EA subcommittee this morning and the focus of their discussion centered around Common and Shared Services and the 2006 IT Strategic Plan. The EA subcommittee was briefed by the Department of State staff on the e-FOR^{3}T project, which has selected a vendor, VIAWest, for the project.

B. IT Risk Management Subcommittee

Arlene Booker reported that the IT Risk Management subcommittee met this morning and the focus of their discussion centered around the CSTARS and CDHS-DVR RISE projects, and the 2006 IT Strategic Plan. Brett Mueller, new CIO for the CSTARS project gave an update to the subcommittee and expects rollout to be sometime in March 2006. Arlene reported that the CDHS-DVR RISE project have added resources and is making good progress. She anticipates their status will move to GREEN in the near future.

C. Policy / Portfolio Subcommittees

Commissioner VanderSchouw reported that the Policy subcommittee met jointly with the Portfolio Subcommittee this morning. The focus of their discussion centered around the proposed IT Contract and the 2006 IT Strategic Plan. The subcommittee is in support of the proposed IT Contract. Representative Coleman, Policy Subcommittee Chairman, changed the meeting time for this subcommittee to 12:30 pm on IMC Fridays in the Legislative Services Building – Audit Hearing Room. During the legislative session, Representative Coleman would not be able to attend a morning meeting.

V. Other Business

Adjournment

Chairman Picanso adjourned the meeting at 4:18 pm.

_____

The next IMC will be held on:
Friday, February 17, 2006
Legislative Services Building – Hearing Room A
200 E. 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80203